

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/465,506	12/16/1999	LANCE LUNDBERG	ICON-102	8959
909 7	590 11/26/2002			
	WINTHROP, LLP		EXAM	INER
P.O. BOX 1050 MCLEAN, VA			AKERS, GE	OFFREY R
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3624	
			DATE MAILED: 11/26/2003	2

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

·		ant(s)	
Office Action Cummary	9/168506 Cudba		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Group Art Unit	
—The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet beneath	the correspondence address	
Period for Reply			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	ET TO EXPIREMO	NTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE	
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by de Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by 	s, a reply within the statutory minimum of the	nirty (30) days will be considered timely. ailing date of this communication .	
Status /	0//		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on	7/23/02	•	
☐ This action is FINAL.	,		
 Since this application is in condition for allowance ex accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 	cept for formal matters, prosecutio , 1935 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 213.	n as to the merits is closed in	
Disposition of Claims	<i>!</i>		
☐-Claim(s)/	- <i>P</i> o	is/are pending in the application.	
Glaim(s) Of the above claim(s)	•	is/are withdrawn from consideration.	
☐ Claim(s)		is/are allowed.	
1 6 50		is/are rejected.	
Defaim(s) / ~ Yo		•	
☐ Claim(s)			
		is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election	
☐ Claim(s)		is/are objected to.	
☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Application Papers ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draftsperson's	awing Review, PTO-948.	is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election requirement.	
☐ Claim(s)————————————————————————————————————	awing Review, PTO-948.	is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election requirement.	
☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Application Papers ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draf	awing Review, PTO-948. is □ approved □ disa	is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election requirement.	
☐ Claim(s)	awing Review, PTO-948 is	is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election requirement.	
☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Application Papers ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draf	awing Review, PTO-948 is	is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election requirement.	
☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Application Papers ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draf	awing Review, PTO-948 is	is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election requirement.	
☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drain ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on ☐ is/are of ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ☐ is/are of ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. ☐ Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign prior ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copie ☐ received.	awing Review, PTO-948 is □ approved □ disable objected to by the Examiner. Her. Fity under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)-(d). Here of the priority documents have be	are subject to restriction or election requirement. approved.	
☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Dra	awing Review, PTO-948. is	are subject to restriction or election requirement. approved.	
☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draftsperson's	awing Review, PTO-948. is	are subject to restriction or election requirement. approved.	
☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Dra	awing Review, PTO-948. is approved disable objected to by the Examiner. Therefore the priority documents have be a second to	are subject to restriction or election requirement. approved. 7.2(a)).	
☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Dra	awing Review, PTO-948. is approved disable objected to by the Examiner. Therefore the priority documents have be a second to	are subject to restriction or election requirement. approved. 7.2(a)).	
☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Application Papers ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draf	awing Review, PTO-948. is approved disable disab	are subject to restriction or election requirement. approved. 7.2(a)).	
Claim(s) Claim(s) Application Papers See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent	awing Review, PTO-948. is approved disable disa	are subject to restriction or election requirement. approved. 7.2(a)).	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Art Unit: 3624

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

- 1. This action is issued in response to applicant's Amendment A(Paper #8) filed 9/23/02.
- 2. No claims were amended. None were deleted. No new claims were added.
- 3. Claims 1-40 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 1-40 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Clark(US Pat. No: 6,351,738) in view of Feidelson(US Pat. No: 6,345,261) and further in view of McClelland(US Pat. No: 5,689,650).
- 6. As per claims 1,6,18,30 Clark teaches a method for supporting security-trade financing for a company seeking capital(Fig 4/416)(col 4 lines 5-14)(col 6 lines 6-7) comprising maintaining an inventory data base including data identifying products(col 4 lines 21-32) and determining a cash/trade-credit blend for the purpose of providing financing to the company wherein the cash/trade-credit blend includes a cash portion and a trade-credit portion(Fig 4/414)(col 5 lines 6-14)(col 6 lines 3-5)(coll 11 line 40-col 12 line 46)(col 12 line 50-56) and receiving at least a portion of the cash/trade-credit blend from the company in exchange for a

Art Unit: 3624

proportional quantity of the products in inventory that are desired by the company(Fig 4/410)(Fig 5)(col 5 lines 21-50)(col 8 line 57-col 10 line 54). Clark further teaches volume rebates(Fig 5) and capital financing(Fig 4). Clark fails to teach receiving securities from the company in exchange for the trade-credit portion of the cash/trade-credit blend, but does teach the ability of equity participants to be part of an IPO without loss of control(col 6 lines 8-9). Feidelson teaches this(Abstract)(Fig 1)(Fig 2)(Fig 3)(col 2 line 6-col 4 line 20).McClelland teaches cash/credit blends(col 6 line 36-col 8 line 4). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine Clark in view of Feidelson to teach the above. The motivation to combine is to teach a user-friendly investment based customer credit program as enunciated by Feidelson(col 2 lines 1-3).It also would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine Clark in view of Feidelson and further in view of McClelland to teach the above. The motivation to combine is to teach a method for allocating business interests to participants in a risk managed portfolio as enunciated by McClelland(col 4 lines 1-3).

7. As per claim 2 Clark teaches according to Claim 1. Clark does not specifically teach further including the steps of receiving deficient assets from a deficient asset company but does teach transmitting trade credits to the deficient asset company(Fig 4/410). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine Clark in view of Feidelson to teach the above. The motivation to combine is to teach a user-friendly investment based customer credit program as enunciated by Feidelson(col 2 lines 1-3). It also would have been obvious to

Art Unit: 3624

one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine Clark in view of Feidelson and further in view of McClelland to teach to teach paying for the deficient assets of a deficient company and storing data identifying the deficient assets in the inventory data base. The motivation to combine is to teach a method for allocating business interests to participants in a risk managed portfolio as enunciated by McClelland(col 4 lines 1-3).

- 8. As per claim 3,10-12,33-34 Clark teaches a method as recited in Claims 1,10,33 wherein the products identified in the inventory data base are categorized(col 9 line 49)(col 10 lines 4-7)(Fig 4/414/418).
- 9. As per claims 4,9 13-14,21-25 Clark teaches a method as recited in Claim 1,10,18,21 wherein the products are selected from the group consisting of goods and services(col 9 line 49)(col 10 lines 4-7)(col 10 line 36)(col 11 lines 40-61).
- 10. As per claim 5,27-28,39-40 Clark teaches a method as recited in Claim 1,18,30 wherein the cash/trade-credit blend is represented by a cash-credit ratio(col 10 lines 34-36). Clark fails to teach a specific cash-credit ratio. Feidelson teaches this(Abstract)(Fig 1)(Fig 2)(Fig 3)(col 2 line 6-col 4 line 20). McClelland teaches cash/credit blends(col 6 line 36-col 8 line 4). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine Clark in view of Feidelson to teach the above. The motivation to combine is to teach a user-friendly investment based customer credit program as enunciated by Feidelson(col 2 lines 1-3). It also would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine Clark in view of Feidelson and further in view of McClelland to teach the above. The motivation to combine is to

Art Unit: 3624

teach a method for allocating business interests to participants in a risk managed portfolio as enunciated by McClelland(col 4 lines 1-3).

- 11. As per claims 7, 16-17,19-20,26,29, 31,37-38 Clark teaches a method as recited in Claims 6,18,19,30 wherein the desired plan cost basis is based on valuations of the company(col 10 lines 43-45)(Fig 4/416).
- 12. As per claims 8,32,35-36 Clark teaches a method as recited in Claim 6,31,34 wherein the valuations include an agreed-to valuation and a desired valuation(col 10 lines 43-45)(Fig 4/416).

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-40 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

14. THIS ACTION IS MADE NON-FINAL.

15. Any questions concerning this communication should be addressed to the examiner of record, Dr. Geoffrey Akers, P.E., who can be reached between 6:30 AM and 5:00 PM Monday through Friday at 703-306-5844. If attempts to contact the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's superior, Mr. Vincent Millin, SPE, may be telephoned at (703)-308-1065.

The fax number for Formal or Official faxes and Draft or Informal faxes to Technology Center 2100 or this Art Unit is (703)-308-6296 or 6306. Any inquiry of a general nature or

Art Unit: 3624

relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703)-305-3900.

November 23, 2002